

Amendments To The Drawings

The attached replacement sheets of drawings contain new Figs. 1 and 2.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed August 26, 2005, the drawings were objected to because they did not show every feature specified in the claims. The attached replacement sheets contain new Figs. 1 and 2, which correspond to the disclosure as it was filed.

When the application was filed in the USPTO, it claimed a Jan. 8, 2002 foreign priority date that was based on two applications that had been filed in China, namely CN02100022.0 (PA1) and CN02120704.6 (PA2). When the case was filed on Jan. 6, 2003, under the PCT (i.e., PCT application no. PCT/CN03/0006) the application was erroneously filed using three figures from Chinese priority document PA1 when it should have been filed using the two figures that had been filed in China as part of PA2.

The enclosed replacement sheets of Figs. 1 and 2 submitted herewith are the drawings from Chinese priority document PA1. Inasmuch as they conform to the written description as it was originally filed and since they conform to the priority documents, no new matter has been added.

The specification was objected to because it was replete with grammatical errors. It was also objected to as containing terms that were not defined.

Two replacement specifications are attached. One of them shows the revisions that were made to the originally-filed specification; the other hides the marked revisions. No new matter has been added. Terms that were not well defined have been defined.

The format of the claims was objected to. Line indentations have been used to

more clearly separate the limitations of claim 1.

The CANDU[®] mark has been clearly identified as a registered trademark in the replacement specification.

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶1 as claiming subject matter that was not described in the specification. In particular, the Examiner contends that the term "low-temperature" is unclear and that it is well-known that typical reactors use a plurality of control rods.

Claims 4 and 5 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶1 because the Examiner contends that it is not understood what is meant by the term "replaces addition of reloading water layer" and that the residual heat cooler in claim 5 was not described.

Claims 4 and 5 as amended delete the phraseology that was objected to/rejected by the Examiner.

Claims 1-5 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2 as being indefinite. In the Office Action the Examiner properly cited numerous ambiguities in the claims as they were filed, which are believed to have been corrected in the extensively revised claims. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by *Gruel*, (DE 3718510A). Claim 1 as amended above (and therefore claim 3 as well) avoids *Gruel*.

In the last line of claim 1 there has been added a limitation stating that *light* water (H₂O) is used as a coolant. *GrueI* teaches that *heavy* water (D₂O) must be used.

Page 8 of the specification as filed disclosed the use of light water as a coolant. Therefore, no new matter has been added and claim 1 as amended avoids *GrueI*.

Since it is axiomatic that claims dependent on an allowable independent claim are themselves *also* allowable, claims 2-5 are therefore also allowable over *GrueI*, including dependent claims 2 and 5.

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *GrueI* in view of Gou et al., i.e., (U.S. no. 5,577,085). Claim 5 was rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over *GrueI* in view of Newton et al. (U.S. no. 5,268,942) and Dickson (U.S. no. 3,309,278).

Using a web browser, the text of *GrueI* published by the U.S. Patent Office on its web site was searched for occurrences of the terms "light" and "light water." Neither term was located in *GrueI*. The text of *Gou* was manually searched for occurrences of the terms but they were also not found in *Gou* either.

Since claim 1 has been amended to recite the use of light water as a coolant, and since the Examiner has not presented any reference or combination of references that teach the use of light water with the other limitations of claim 1, the Applicant contends that dependent claims 2 and 5 are also allowable because they depend from an allowable claim 1.

Since the Examiner's objections to the specification are believed to have been overcome and since the claim rejections are believed to have been traversed, the

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-5 are in now condition for allowance and therefore respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 22, 2005



Joseph P. Krause, Reg. No. 32,578
Ladas & Parry
224 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 427-1300

Application Serial No. 10/500,809
Reply to Office Action of August 26, 2005

PATENT
Docket: CU-3830



APPENDIX OF ATTACHMENTS

Application Serial No. 10/500,809
Reply to Office Action of August 26, 2005

**Two Replacement Sheets of new FIGS. 1 and 2
(a total of 2 sheets of drawings)**